

**Appendix E**  
**Community Plan Updates**  
**Recommended Revisions**



This appendix includes the status, recommended revisions and outstanding issues of each Community or Subregional Plan. Each plan is identified as either a Comprehensive Update, which would take the place of the existing community plan, or a Consistency Review, with edits from the existing Community Plan. An Overview of the plan is provided, Issues are identified and the Staff Recommendation is included.

### **Alpine Community Plan – *Consistency Review***

The existing Alpine Community Plan was reviewed and edited by staff for consistency with the General Plan Update. No public comments were received regarding the Alpine Community Plan.

**Issues:** *No significant issues.*

**Staff Recommendation:**

- Retain the draft Community Plan, as circulated for public review July 1, 2009, but establish a special study area in the Village north of Interstate 8 and west of Tavern Road to determine the appropriate land uses and intensities that will result in an acceptable level of service to accommodate forecast traffic volumes at the Interstate 8 interchanges with Tavern Road
- Undertake a comprehensive update after the adoption of the General Plan Update, based on staff availability and resources.

### **Bonsall Community Plan – *Comprehensive Update***

A comprehensive update to the existing Bonsall Community Plan was prepared by the Bonsall Community Sponsor Group. This Community Plan emphasizes support for the agricultural and equestrian character of the Community.

**Issues:** *Conservation Subdivision Program (CSP):* Sponsor Group disagrees with the staff recommended policies to adapt the CSP to Bonsall's community character. The Sponsor Group has requested additional restrictions on the program, such as larger minimum lot sizes; however have not been clear as to what those specific increases in restrictions should be.

**Staff Recommendation:**

- Retain the staff-recommended CSP policies, as circulated for public review July 1, 2009.
- Incorporate other minor edits received from the Bonsall Sponsor Group during public review.

### **Borrego Springs Community Plan – *Comprehensive Update***

The Borrego Springs A subcommittee of the Borrego Springs Sponsor Group prepared a comprehensive update, including a new vision for the community that recognizes the uniqueness of this community, as compared to other parts of San Diego County. Key aspects are additional policies to protect dark skies, minimize

severe grading from development, and encourage decomposed granite instead of asphalt pavement in appropriate areas. The plan establishes special studies that would transform the town center into a walkable village that promotes economic development, encourage the conversion of farmlands into less water-intensive land uses to facilitate the use of the water savings by new less water-intensive development, and support environmental resource protection.

**Issues:** There are no significant areas of controversy; however, the two significant issues addressed include establishing a sustainable supply of water supply for the community and the preservation of Dark Skies. The Borrego Springs Sponsor Group submitted updated information regarding the Borrego Water District's efforts to address water supply issues, and the recent establishment of Borrego Springs as an International Dark Sky Community.

**Staff Recommendation:**

- Retain Borrego Springs CP as circulated for public review July 1, 2009, with revisions as suggested by Borrego Springs CSG.

**Central Mountain Subregional Plan (Cuyamaca, Descanso & Pine Valley) -  
Consistency Review**

The existing Central Mountain Subregional Plan was revised with input from each of the community groups, who jointly developed a Vision Statement for the Subregion Planning Area.

**Issues:** No significant issues; however, one public comment requested removing a policy to discourage off-road vehicle parks in the Subregional Planning Area, staff does not agree that any edits are necessary.

**Staff Recommendation:**

- Incorporate minor edits received from the Cuyamaca and Descanso Planning Groups.
- Complete review of the additional comprehensive update prepared for the Pine Valley Subregional Group area by Pine Valley Planning Group and circulate the plan for public review so that it can be adopted with the General Plan Update.

**Crest, Dehesa, Harbison Canyon and Granite Hills Subregional Plan –  
Consistency Review**

The existing Crest, Dehesa, Harbison Canyon and Granite Hills Subregional Plan was reviewed by staff for consistency with the General Plan Update and changes were coordinated with the Community Planning Group.

**Issues:** *No significant issues*, the Planning Group has recently prepared an updated Vision Statement that has not yet been reviewed by staff and has requested that additional minor edits be made to the Subregional Plan regarding outdated figures and background information.

**Staff Recommendation:**

- Review and incorporate the updated vision statement and recommended edits received from the Crest, Dehesa, Harbison Canyon, and Granite Hills Planning Group into the version circulated for public review July 1, 2009.
- Undertake a comprehensive update after the adoption of the General Plan Update, based on staff availability and resources.

### **Fallbrook Community Plan - *Comprehensive Update***

The Fallbrook Community Planning Group prepared a comprehensive update to the Community Plan, which identifies agriculture and associated uses as important to the community, as well as the retention of the Village Style architecture and community character in the Town Center. The Fallbrook Community Planning Group is also working on further refinements to the Community Plan. Once these refinements are received they can be sent out for a public review, and it is anticipated they can go forward with the General Plan Update.

**Issues:** *No significant issues.*

**Staff Recommendation:**

- Revise the document circulated for public review July 1, 2009, to incorporate additional revisions provided by the Planning Group.

### **Jamul / Dulzura Community Plan – *Consistency Review***

The existing Jamul / Dulzura Community Plan was reviewed and edited by staff for consistency with the General Plan Update. These edits were coordinated with the Community Planning Group.

**Issues:** No significant issues; however, comments were received from the Jamul/Dulzura Community Planning Group requesting further restrictions on clustered development, along with additional edits to background information.

**Staff Recommendation:**

- Incorporate the recommended minor edits received from the Jamul/Dulzura Community Planning Group into the version circulated for public review July 1, 2009.
- Resolve issues regarding additional restrictions on clustered development.

### **Julian Community Plan- *Consistency Review***

The existing Julian Community Plan was reviewed and edited by staff for consistency with the General Plan Update. These edits were coordinated with the Julian Community Planning Group. No additional comments were received regarding the Julian Community Plan when the plan was circulated for public review.

**Issues:** *No significant issues.*

**Staff Recommendation:**

- Retain the draft Community Plan, as circulated for public review July 1, 2009.

### **Lakeside Community Plan- *Consistency Review***

The Lakeside Community Plan was reviewed and edited by staff for consistency with the General Plan Update. Initially the Planning Group endorsed staff edits to the consistency review, and this plan was circulated for public review in July 2009. No additional public comments were received regarding the Lakeside Community Plan. Concurrently, the Planning Group prepared a more comprehensive update that has since been reviewed by staff.

**Issues:** The Lakeside Planning Group now opposes the consistency review of the Lakeside Community Plan and has endorsed a draft comprehensive update. Staff reviewed the comprehensive update and provided the Planning Group with initial comments.

**Staff Recommendation:**

- Recirculate the more comprehensive update of the Community Plan if coordination efforts with the Planning Group are completed by the end of the year. Otherwise, retain the draft Community Plan as circulated for public review July 1, 2009.
- Continue to prepare additional updates to the Lakeside Community Plan, based on the availability of staff and resources.

### **Mountain Empire Subregional Plan (Boulevard) – *Comprehensive Update***

A comprehensive update of the existing Community Plan was prepared by the Boulevard Community Planning Group and reviewed by staff. The Boulevard Community Plan supports preservation of the rural and ranch nature of the community.

**Issues:** *Conservation Subdivision Program (CSP):* Boulevard Planning Group wants additional restrictions on Conservation Subdivisions, such as larger minimum lot sizes to match the Rural Lands densities applied to the community. Staff recommends minimum lot sizes based on their current zoning; generally four to eight acres, with restrictions allowed based upon the CSP methods, lot area averaging and Planned Residential Development. Staff further contends that lots sizes should not be increased beyond what is currently allowed by zoning because flexibility needs to be retained so that the parcel can be fully developed, often at the decreased density recommended by the General Plan Update.

*Wind Turbines:* Draft Community Plan policies strongly discourage wind turbine facilities. Several negative comments were received during public review concerning the negative language of these policies.

**Staff Recommendation:**

- Retain the staff-recommended CSP policies, as circulated for public review July 1, 2009.

- Revise and remove editorial comments in the community plan background section concerning off-road vehicle facilities, wind turbines, and landfills.

### **Mountain Empire Subregional Plan (Potrero) – *Comprehensive Update***

The Potrero Community Planning Group prepared a comprehensive update to the existing Community Plan that was reviewed by staff and circulated for public review in July 2009. This Plan emphasizes resource conservation, open space, and appropriate rural-sized commercial facilities and development.

**Issues:** *Conservation Subdivision Program (CSP):* There are two recommendations included in the Potrero Community Plan, from the County and from the Potrero Planning Group. Similar issues that are addressed under the Boulevard Subregional Group Area Plan, Potrero would like to increase minimum lot sizes beyond what is required in existing zoning. It is the opinion of the County that the draft policies, especially combined with the Staff Recommended Land Use Map in Appendix D are appropriate restrictions.

**Staff Recommendation:**

- Retain the staff-recommended CSP policies, as circulated for public review July 1, 2009.

### **Mountain Empire Subregional Plan (Campo/Lake Morena, Tecate & Jacumba) – *Consistency Review***

The Campo / Lake Morena, Tecate, and Jacumba Community Groups have worked with staff to develop a consistency review for the Mountain Empire Subregional Plan. Jacumba has provided updated History and Vision sections for the Community.

**Issues:** *No significant issues*, with the Campo / Lake Morena and Jacumba Community Plans. Ketchum Ranch has requested the Specific Plan section be updated to reflect the current proposals.

*Tecate Special Study:* Staff is working with the Tecate Sponsor Group to develop a special study area to incorporate into the Plan. The text is being refined, and will include restrictions on land use intensity based on the number of vehicle trips generated on State Route 94.

**Staff Recommendation:**

- Retain the draft Subregional Plan, as circulated for public review July 1, 2009, with revisions from the Tecate Special Study Area, and update text to reflect Ketchum Ranch development.
- Recirculate the Tecate section of the Subregional Plan, once the text for the special study area is prepared.
- Undertake additional updates following adoption of the General Plan Update, based on staff availability and resources.

### **North County Metropolitan Subregional Plan (Twin Oaks & Hidden Meadows) – Consistency Review**

The existing North County Metro Subregional Plan was reviewed and edited by staff for consistency with the General Plan Update. The staff edits were reviewed by the Twin Oaks and Hidden Meadows Sponsor Groups. No comments were received when the Plan was circulated for public review in July 2009. In September 2009 the Hidden Meadows Sponsor Group drafted a Comprehensive update for the Hidden Meadows Community Area; this plan is still pending review by staff.

**Issues:** *No significant issues*

**Staff Recommendation:**

- Retain the draft Community Plan, as circulated for public review July 1, 2009.
- Assuming staff review and edits occur before the end of the year, staff will recirculate the revised Hidden Meadows Plan so that it can go forward with adoption of the General Plan Update

### **North Mountain Subregional Plan (Greater Warner Springs) - Comprehensive**

The Greater Warner Springs portion of the North Mountain Subregional Community Plan was developed by a group of citizens in the area to encourage retention and possible expansion of the community as a Rural Village.

**Issues:** *Off Road Vehicles:* The Greater Warner Springs Group [desires](#) additional restrictions for off-road vehicles on private property, as well as increased noise enforcement. Staff does not agree that additional restrictions are appropriate.

**Staff Recommendation:**

- Retain the draft Community Plan, as circulated for public review July 1, 2009, with no additional restrictions for off-road vehicles.

### **North Mountain Subregional Plan - Consistency**

The remainder of the North Mountain Subregion is addressed by the Subregional Plan, including the community of Palomar Mountain. Staff incorporated some edits from the Palomar Mountain Planning Organization, but expects to have more comprehensive edits in the future.

**Issues:** *No significant issues.*

**Staff Recommendation:**

- Retain the draft Subregional Plan, as circulated for public review July 1, 2009
- Undertake future updates following adoption of the General Plan Update, based on the availability of staff and resources.



### **Otay Subregional Plan- *Consistency Review***

The existing Otay Subregional Plan was reviewed and edited by staff for consistency with the General Plan Update. No additional public comments were received regarding the Otay Subregional Plan.

**Issues:**     *No significant issues.*

**Staff Recommendation:**

- Retain the draft Subregional Plan, as circulated for public review July 1, 2009.

### **Pala - Pauma Valley Subregional Plan- *Consistency Review***

The existing Pala - Pauma Valley Community Plan was reviewed and edited by staff for consistency with the General Plan Update. These edits were coordinated with the Community Sponsor Group. No comments were received regarding the Pala-Pauma Valley Community Plan during the July 2009 public review.

**Issues:**     *No significant issues.*

**Staff Recommendation:**

- Retain the draft Community Plan, as circulated for public review July 1, 2009.
- Undertake future updates following adoption of the General Plan Update, based on the availability of staff and resources.

### **Rainbow Community Plan- *Consistency Review***

The existing Rainbow Community Plan was edited and reviewed by staff for consistency with the General Plan Update. These edits were coordinated with the Community Planning Group. No additional public comments were received regarding the Rainbow Community Plan.

**Issues:**     *Extractive Industry:* The Rainbow Community Planning group would like to add policies that would prohibit all mining activities in the Community Planning area.

**Staff Recommendation:**

- Staff can not support the prohibition of all mining activities in the community planning area because the County does not prohibit uses in communities, rather identifies what uses are allowed, and if necessary put parameters on those uses so they won't negatively impact the community.
- Retain the draft Community Plan, as circulated for public review July 1, 2009.
- Undertake future updates following adoption of the General Plan Update, based on the availability of staff and resources.

### **Ramona Community Plan – *Comprehensive Update***

The Ramona Community Plan includes provisions to encourage the Town Center as the viable commercial area, the keeping of leisure animals, as well as the development of community parks and facilities. There are refinements that can be made outside of the General Plan Update

**Issues:** *Town Center (Form Based Code):* Ramona has been developing a Form Based Code for its town center, the framework for implementing this code should be established in the Community Plan

**Staff Recommendation:**

- Retain the draft Community Plan, as circulated for public review July 1, 2009, with revisions to incorporate the foundation for implementing the Form Based Code Framework.
- Undertake future updates following adoption of the General Plan Update, based on staff availability and resources.

### **San Dieguito Community Plan – *Consistency Review***

San Dieguito is comprised of many unique communities, many of which are built-out specific plans. The Plan was updated to include additional policies and text from the each community and best available information, but is also currently undergoing revisions with a Subcommittee for further refinements.

**Issues:** *No significant issues*, future refinements are needed to more comprehensively update the Community Plan.

**Staff Recommendation:**

- Retain the draft Community Plan, as circulated for public review July 1, 2009
- Undertake future updates following adoption of the General Plan Update, based on staff availability and resources.

### **San Dieguito Community Plan (Elfin Forest and Harmony Grove) – *Comprehensive Update***

The Elfin Forest and Harmony Grove Plan retains the unique characters of each community as distinct areas of San Dieguito. They included policies for the protection of resources, as well as the protection of equestrian uses in Harmony Grove.

**Issues:** *No significant issues*, the Town Council requested the plan be updated to more clearly include the area boundary the plan is applicable to.

**Staff Recommendation:**

- Retain the draft Community Plan, as circulated for public review July 1, 2009, with revisions to clearly reflect the appropriate boundary.

### **Spring Valley Community Plan – *Comprehensive Update***

The Spring Valley Community Plan is prepared for a community that will not see additional growth, except for revitalization. It addresses issues unique to a long established urban community, such the need for revitalized housing areas, parking, a need for code enforcement and the desire for revitalization activities in certain areas. The Plan includes a list of concerns the community has over the years with limited planning support.

**Issues:** *Special Study Areas:* The Community Planning Group has identified a special study area for Caltrans property that is not longer needed for the construction State Route 54. The Group plans to identify the uses that are appropriate for that area and include this information in their Community Plan. Another special study area is the commercial area around Grand Avenue and Jamaica Boulevard.

*Affordable Housing:* Spring Valley has recommended strict policies regarding the addition of any additional subsidized affordable housing in the community until other unincorporated communities receive the same proportion.

*Grandfathered Uses:* Spring Valley has recommended restrictions on grandfathered uses, specifically how the uses can transfer in ownership. Staff is determining what can be done to further restrict grandfathering and plans to refine this section accordingly.

**Staff Recommendation:**

- Retain the draft community Plan, as circulated for public review July 1, 2009, and revise is with the following:
  - To include the Special Study Areas,
  - Revised affordable housing policies, to limit the County from using County of San Diego funding for affordable housing in Spring Valley, but not limit privately-funded affordable housing, and
  - Revised grandfathering policies, as determined are appropriate.

### **Sweetwater Community Plan- *Consistency Review***

The Sweetwater Community Plan was reviewed and edited by staff for consistency with the General Plan Update. These edits were coordinated with the Community Planning Group. No additional public comments were received regarding the Sweetwater Community Plan.

**Issues:** *No significant issues.*

**Staff Recommendation:**

- Retain the draft Community Plan, as circulated for public review July 1, 2009.

### **Valle de Oro Community Plan – *Consistency Review***

Valle de Oro Community Plan was revised in many public hearings early in the General Plan Update process, this Plan reflects the community's desire to balance urban, semi-rural, agricultural and Open Space uses.

**Issues:** *No significant issues*, minor edits were submitted by the Planning Group to update discussion and figures.

**Staff Recommendation:**

- Incorporate edits received from the Valle de Oro Planning Group into the version circulated for public review July 1, 2009.

### **Valley Center Community Plan- *Consistency Review***

The Valley Center Community Plan was reviewed and edited with direct input from the Community Planning Group. No additional public comments were received regarding the Valley Center Community Plan. The Community Planning Group is currently preparing a comprehensive update to the Community Plan that would be submitted for adoption after the adoption of the General Plan Update.

**Issues:** *No significant issues.*

**Staff Recommendation:**

- Retain the draft Community Plan, as circulated for public review July 1, 2009 with necessary edits to SPA descriptions.
- Coordinate with the Planning Group to adopt a comprehensive Community Plan Update after the adoption of the General Plan Update.